



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Applicant: Shoichi SAWA et al.
Title: INFLATOR
Appl. No.: 10/064,064
Filing Date: 06/06/2002
Examiner: K. Smith
Art Unit: 3644

REPLY BRIEF

Mail Stop APPEAL BRIEF-PATENTS
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir,

This communication is in response to the Examiner's Answer dated November 30, 2004, concerning the above referenced patent application.

Consideration of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 10

Claims 1 and 10 call for the projection to be configured "to move axially within the other of the receiving member or bottle prior to mating with the groove." The Examiner argues that Brown, as modified by White, teaches a projection that is "configured to move axially within the receiving member prior to mating with the groove". (See Examiner's Answer at page 3). White teaches that bayonet slots 6 on element 1 receive lugs 11. (See White at column 1, lines 43-46). Figure 1 illustrates that the bayonet slots 6 have openings at the right edge of the coupling element 1 for receiving the lugs and there is no other opening or position for the lugs 11 to be received within coupling element 1. Therefore, axial movement of the lugs 11 only occurs after the lugs 11 are inside and mated with the bayonet slots 6. Thus, Brown and White do not teach all of the limitations recited by claims 1 and 10 and the rejection should be withdrawn.